

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action of November 9, 2010, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claim 21 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim 21 is also rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83 (a).

Claims 17-20, 22-27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over the patent to Fitzsimmons in view of the patent to Perkins.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) over Fitzsimmons and Perkins, and further in view of the patent to McClay.

Claims 32 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, Applicant has canceled claim 21.

Although Applicant disagrees with the majority of the comments made by the Examiner in paragraph 8 on page 4 of the Office Action relative to claim 21, in order to further prosecution of the application, Applicant has chosen to simply cancel claim 21. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claim 21 under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, with the cancelation of claim 21 it is submitted that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83 (a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

As has been previously argued, Fitzsimmons teaches the insertion of two cassettes with a common adjustment piece. However, there is no teaching of the common adjustment of cutting inserts and guide elements. Perkins does not show a simultaneous adjustment. Instead, the cutting inserts are adjusted by externally-accessible screws. The single, common feature is an obviously cylindrical, centrally-arranged stop (stem 0). The stop is not an adjustment means that can be exchanged, but is instead a pure stop. The adjustment or setting takes place via the screw K1 and K2. Furthermore, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to provide one of the cutting inserts of Fitzsimmons with a guide element. To begin with, there is nothing in the teachings of Fitzsimmons which indicates or suggests the need for a guide element. Thus, it would not be obvious to modify the construction of Fitzsimmons as suggested by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17-20, 22-27, 30 and 31 under 35 USC 103 (a) over a combination of the above discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to McClay has also been considered. This reference adds nothing to the teachings of the previously discussed references so as to teach the presently claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 34 under 35 USC 103 (a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due. However, if any fee is determined to be due, authorization is hereby given to charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2275. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), please treat this and any concurrent or future reply in this application that requires a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. The fee associated therewith is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By:



Klaus P. Stoffel, Reg. No. 31,668
(Attorney for Applicant)
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
Tel: (212) 661-8000

February 9, 2011

KPS/ns

Certificate of EFS-Web Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by EFS-Web to the Commissioner for Patents on February 9, 2011.

By:



Klaus P. Stoffel